

Appl. No. 09/681,855
Amdt. dated March 07, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3, and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faltermeier et al. (US 5,712,725) in view of Lo (US 5,699,083) for reasons recited on the above-indicated Office action.

Response:

The applicant has identified three main patentable differences between independent claim 1 of the instant application and the Faltermeier and Lo patents.

1. Neither the Faltermeier patent nor the Lo patent teach "a control unit for controlling the pointing device," as is recited in claim 1. The Examiner states on page 2 of the Office action of January 19, 2005 that Faltermeier teaches a pointing device that is a mouse. In addition, the Examiner states that Faltermeier teaches a control unit (1). However, it is not possible for the mouse to be both the pointing device and the control unit. For instance, claim 1 contains the limitations "the pointing device comprising: ... a control unit for controlling the pointing device." Therefore, if Faltermeier's mouse is both the pointing device and the control unit, the strange situation exists in which the mouse contains a mouse for controlling the mouse. Not only is this not logical, but it also precludes the use of Faltermeier in teaching these limitations of claim 1 since Faltermeier does not teach a control unit within a pointing device that is used for controlling the pointing device.

2. Neither the Faltermeier patent nor the Lo patent teach a control unit that responds to state signals received from a computer. Claim 1 contains the limitations "wherein when the computer transmits a state signal to the pointing device, the control unit controls the light source to determine an illumination mode of the

Appl. No. 09/681,855
Amdt. dated March 07, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2005

rollable device according to the state signal.”

5 Faltermeier and Lo each teach a mouse used for transmitting control signals to an object. However, neither Faltermeier nor Lo teach or suggest that a computer transmits a state signal to the pointing device and that the control unit controls the lights source according to the state signal.

10 3. The Faltermeier patent does not teach that the pointing unit (12a) is installed inside the housing of the pointing device (1), as is required in claim 1. Therefore, the use of the Faltermeier reference is inappropriate for teaching this limitation of claim 1.

15 In summary, because these three limitations are not taught by the combination of Faltermeier and Lo, claim 1 is not unpatentable over the cited references, and the applicants respectfully request that the final rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn accordingly.

20 Claims 23, 24, and 26-30 are cancelled, and are no longer in need of consideration. Claims 2-22 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-22 is respectfully requested. Based on the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 09/681,855
Amdt. dated March 07, 2005
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2005

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: March 7, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan).